

### REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application, of which Claims 1, 8, 14, 16, 18 and 20 are in independent form. Claims 2, 7, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19 and 21 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. It should be noted that the changes made to the claims are to clarify what Applicant was in his view already claiming, and thus do not represent a narrowing of the intended scope of any claim recitation.

Claims 1, 8, 14, 16, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, and also as not supported by an enabling disclosure.

In view of the Examiner's comments in the outstanding Office Action, Applicant submits the following observations:

(1) In the embodiment described with reference to Fig. 22m the distance between white points is an index to search a set of colorimetric data of a light source. The light source returned as a result of such a search has a white point similar to the white point of the input viewing condition.

(2) Instead of using the white point itself, the color temperature of the white point can be used as the index for the search (this is described at page 52, line 20, through page 53, line 2).

(3) The white point itself is one of the viewing conditions (as described at page 48, lines 17-21, and page 59, lines 3-5 and 12-14).

Accordingly, it will be appreciated that the portion of the disclosure previously cited by Applicant as supporting the present claims relates to the idea of comparing the input viewing condition and the viewing conditions of the various light sources, but uses terminology referring to the white points, and to the distances between white points. Applicant submits that in view of this point, the application as filed provided all required written description of, and enablement of, the present claims, and withdrawal of the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 9, 15, 17, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Those claims have been carefully reviewed and have been amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they comply with Section 112, second paragraph, with particular attention to the points raised at page 4 of the Office Action. It is respectfully requested that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 8-11 and 14-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,546,195 (Arai). Claims 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from *Arai '195* in view of U.S. Patent 5,748,342 (Usami), and Claims 7 and 13 were rejected as being obvious from *Arai '195*.

The general purpose and nature of the present invention have been discussed in previous papers. Independent Claim 1 is directed to an image processing method, in which there are obtained a plurality of sets of colorimetric data which correspond to

respective light sources. A viewing condition is input, and the input viewing condition is compared with conditions of the light sources to select a set of colorimetric data corresponding to a light source that has a condition similar to the input viewing condition, from the plurality of sets of colorimetric data. Then, colorimetric data depending on the input viewing condition is conjectured, from the selected set of colorimetric data.

Thus, in a method according to Claim 1, colorimetric data depending on an input viewing condition can be conjectured from existing colorimetric data. If, however, the existing colorimetric data used as the basis for such a conjecture relates to a viewing condition different from the input viewing condition, the result of the conjecture will not be as accurate as is desired. Therefore, to achieve better accuracy, existing colorimetric data having a viewing condition the same as or similar to that of the input viewing condition is searched for, and the result is then used as the basis for the conjecture.

*Arai* relates to a color-image reproduction system, in which external illuminant light is measured, and a workstation 32 (Fig. 3) determines the type of illuminant being used based on the measurement (see Fig. 9). A selection signal "s" and corresponding colorimetric data "c" are sent to a neural network management unit 3, which selects among neural networks 3a - 3n corresponding to respective types of illuminant. The selected network converts the colorimetric data to a color separation value that is then used in the outputting of the color image. The conversion performed by the selected neural network is a conventional technique (col. 5, lines 35-39). Thus, the *Arai* approach involves selecting the proper neural network in accordance with the type of standard illuminant. As noted above, the method of Claim 1 involves selecting a set of colorimetric data in

accordance with the input viewing condition for the purpose of then conjecturing colorimetric data in dependence on the input viewing condition. Applicant does not understand how one of ordinary skill would find this to be suggested, or even hinted at, by the *Arai* approach.

For these reasons, Applicant believes strongly that Claim 1 is allowable over *Tanaka*.

Independent Claim 8 is directed to an image processing method in which there are obtained a plurality of sets of colorimetric data which correspond to respective light sources. A viewing condition is input, and a comparison is made between the input viewing condition and conditions of the light sources to select a set of colorimetric data corresponding to a light source that has a condition similar to the input viewing condition, from the plurality of sets of colorimetric data. Data for is generated color matching corresponding to the input viewing condition based on the selected set of colorimetric data.

Claim 8 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Arai* for at least the reasons presented above with regard to Claim 1.

Each of the other independent claims is either an apparatus claim, or a program-product claim, corresponding to one of the other of the method claims discussed above, and is deemed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with regard to Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a

reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "L. P. Diana", is written over a horizontal line.

Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 513720v1